UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,801	02/04/2000	David Angelo Ferrucci	YO999-201	7921

			EXAMINER
21254	7590	04/06/2006	HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/497,801	FERRUCCI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Doug Hutton	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 February 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,21 and 25-44</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,21,25-32 and 37-44</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>33-36</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 February 2000</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20060329

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

02/23/2006 has been entered.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 02/23/2006, Applicant added new Claims 41-44.

Additionally, in Applicant's Response dated 01/23/2006, Applicant amended Claims 30

and 40.

In light of the amendment to Claim 30, the objection previously set forth is

withdrawn. In light of the amendment to Claim 40, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112,

first paragraph, previously set forth is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 41-43:

Claim 41 recites the limitation "**re-using previously authored** text and **description of the document and domain**" [emphasis added] (see Line 2). There is **no** mention in the original Specification of reusing "*previously authored* **descriptions**" of the <u>document</u> and <u>domain</u>. Thus, it is unclear whether the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the present application was filed.

Additionally, the examiner is unsure of the scope of this limitation, as indicated in the following rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "*explicitly defining declarative knowledge representations that enable automatic assembly of documents* **through automatic creation of a document assembly program**" [emphasis added] (see Lines 2-3). There is **nothing** in the original Specification that affirmatively states that a "*document assembly program*" is automatically created.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes these features of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Claim 43 recites the limitation that "**no programming is required for document assembly**" [emphasis added] (see Lines 2-3). There is **nothing** in the original Specification that affirmatively states that "*no programming is required*" for document assembly.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes these features of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate these rejections by canceling the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 41:

Claim 41 recites "*re-using **previously authored** text and __description__ **of the**

document and domain"* [emphasis added] (see Line 2). This limitation is indefinite

because it is unclear what "*descriptions*" of the document and the domain are. Upon

review of the Specification, the examiner could not locate any discussion of

"*descriptions*" of the document and the domain that were "*previously authored.*" Thus,

the intended scope of the limitation (i.e., "*re-using previously authored text and

description of the document and domain*") is indefinite.

Applicant must amend the claim to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention using language from the original

Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 21, 25-32 and 37-40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Porter, U.S. Patent No. 6,473,892. Also, Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Porter.

Claim 1:

Porter discloses *a method of linking domain knowledge to document knowledge* (see Figures 1-10; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 20, Line 34 – Porter discloses this limitation, as indicated in the cited figures and text and in the following discussion), *comprising:*

- *rendering document knowledge as textual components with variable fields* (**The examiner's interpretation** → This limitation means that a series of questions is presented to the user of the document assembly system, wherein the questions comprise text components that have variable field lengths - hereinafter, "text variables." In *Porter* – see Figures 1 and 2; see Column 6, Line 63 through Column 7, Line 53 → Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system comprises a library that includes form generators, wherein each form generator is associated with a particular type of document and is used to assemble that type of document. Each form generator comprises code that selects the structural features of the document type, properties to be used when assembling the document type and text to be included in the document type.);

- *building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge* (**The examiner's interpretation** → This limitation means that a domain has been built, wherein the domain is "object-oriented" and comprises a collection of

objects - hereinafter, "domain objects" - that includes every possible scenario

regarding the questions posed to the user, the answers submitted by the user

and the objects used in assembling a document. In **Porter** – see Figures 1 and

2; see Column 6, Line 63 through Column 8, Line 14; see Column 8, Lines 15-33;

see Column 12, Lines 23-51; see Column 17, Lines 24-55 → Porter discloses

this limitation in that the document assembly system comprises objects that are

used to obtain input from the user and assemble a document. For example, the

system comprises the domain "Construction Loans," which includes the objects

needed to assemble a "Construction Loan" document. The system also

comprises a "Loan Agreement" domain and a "Real Estate Document" domain.

Each domain comprises document definition objects, party definition objects,

signature definition objects, text objects and macro objects associated with a

type of document. The system also comprises source code objects that allow the

various objects associated with the particular type of document to communicate.

Accordingly, the domains of the system are "object-oriented." Moreover, Porter

suggests modular organization and structure of a document system that

simplifies the job of programmers by grouping procedures into easily-

manageable modules that allow the programmer to edit a single object of the

system and thereby propagate the change to all related objects. This is the

essence of "object-oriented" programming.), *wherein said building an object-

oriented domain model comprises organizing data input by a user into said*

domain model (**The examiner's interpretation** → This limitation means that the

answers given by the user are used to obtain objects from the domain in order to assemble the document. In **Porter** – see Figures 1 and 2; see Column 7, Lines 11-53 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system, in order to assemble a document, takes the input data (i.e., the answers) submitted by the user, creates an "input data" object and accesses all of the associated objects via associated procedures in order to dynamically assemble the document. Thus, through the associated procedures, the input data submitted by the user is *"organized into"* the domain.); *and*

- *linking said document knowledge to said domain knowledge, by linking said domain knowledge to document knowledge variables* (**The examiner's interpretation** → This limitation means connections between the "text variables" and the "domain objects" have been established. In **Porter** – see Column 8, Lines 16-34; see Column 14, Line 64 through Column 15, Line 7 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system expressly links the "Construction" domain to the "Loan Type" variable and the "Texas" domain to the "DocST" variable. That is, when the user enters "Construction" into the "Loan Type" question, the system links this data input with the "Construction" domain and thus accesses all of the associated objects needed to assemble that particular type of document. Also, factors that affect the document content appear as variables or procedures in source code rules. That is, the rules link the document model with the domain objects used to assemble the document.).

Claim 2:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said document knowledge variables are linked to domain knowledge elements in said domain model, such that if rules and constraints are tailored or developed to maintain consistency of the domain model, a document model will be affected* (see Column 15, Lines 21-67; Column 17, Lines 24-55 → Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system accepts data input from the user and this data input is linked to a particular domain, where the procedures associated with the input require that specific text objects be inserted into the document. For example, as expressly disclosed in Porter, a user may input "Arkansas," where the "Arkansas" domain requires that a party name be inserted into the document. Additionally, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, a programmer may edit a single object or procedure of the system, and the system propagates the change to all objects associated with the edited object or procedure.).

Claim 3:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein elements in the domain model influence what appears in a rendered document* (Porter discloses this limitation in that the domain comprises the objects that are used to assemble a document).

Claim 4:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises an explicit domain model which is reusable for a plurality of documents* (Porter discloses

this limitation in that the domains may be used to create a plurality of documents at different times. Thus, the domains are "reusable" and "loosely coupled" to the created documents.).

Claim 5:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said object-oriented domain model is independent of any document to be rendered* (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 4, the domains are "loosely coupled" to the created documents), *said domain model being usable for any of a plurality of documents* (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 4, Porter discloses this limitation) *and consistency of a document model is maintained based on said linking* (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 2, any edit to a single object or procedure of the document assembly system is propagated to all objects associated with the edited object or procedure).

Claim 6:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein a plurality of documents are configurable from the domain model* (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 4, Porter discloses this limitation).

Claim 7:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises a*

stand-alone domain model, which is built separate and independent from a document

(as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 4 and 5, Porter discloses this

limitation).

Claim 26:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain knowledge*

comprises domain knowledge elements (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1,

Porter discloses this limitation. Moreover, "domain knowledge" **inherently** includes

"domain knowledge elements," and thus this limitation does not further limit the scope of

the invention.), *and said domain knowledge elements are linked to said document*

knowledge variables (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses

this limitation).

Claim 27:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 26, wherein said domain knowledge*

elements are dynamically bound to said document knowledge variables through an

object model access expression (**The examiner's interpretation** → The phrase "*object*

model access expression" merely signifies the rules that establish the links generated at

runtime between the series of questions presented to the user, the answers submitted

by the user and the objects that are accessed in order to assemble the document. In

Porter – as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation).

Claim 28:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 27, wherein each of said document*

knowledge variables is assigned an object model access expression (Porter discloses

this limitation in that the rules of the document assembly system address all possible

answers submitted by the user)

Claim 29:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 27, further comprising:*

* *enforcing the link between said domain knowledge and said document*

    knowledge whenever a change occurs in at least one of said object model

    access expression of one of said document knowledge variables and said

    domain model (Porter discloses this limitation in that, because the rules **define**

    the links, the links between the domain knowledge and the document knowledge

    are always "enforced." That is, any change that is made in the rules that

    establish the links between the document model and the domain will be

    "enforced" whenever a document is assembled.).

Claim 30:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 27, further comprising:*

- *evaluating the object model access expression of each of said document knowledge variables and linking them to appropriate domain knowledge elements whenever new document knowledge is inputted* (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 4, the domains are "loosely coupled" to the created documents. Thus, each time the user answers the series of questions to create a new document, the document assembly system executes the rules that establish the links between the data input by the user and all of the associated objects needed to assemble the document.).

Claim 31:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 27, further comprising:*

- *re-evaluating the object model access expression of each of said document knowledge variables whenever the domain model is reorganized* (see Column 17, Lines 23-55 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system is modular and allows to a programmer to edit the domain objects. Because the domains are "loosely coupled" to the documents created by the document assembly system, the system will "re-evaluate" the rules that establish the links upon any use of the system subsequent to the editing of the domain objects.).

Claim 32:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 26, wherein said document knowledge variables are linked to said domain knowledge elements by selecting specific properties from the domain model by an object representation and access language, wherein said object representation and access language comprises a plurality of ORAL expressions* (As indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 2, Porter discloses rules that link the series of questions presented to the user via a GUI to the objects in the source code library. These rules comprise an *"object representation and access language"* and a *"plurality of ORAL expressions"* in that the rules are written in a computer language and comprise a plurality of rules. The rules link document knowledge variables to domain knowledge elements by *"selecting specific properties from the domain model"* in that the rules affect the content and structure of the assembled document. That is, based on the user's answers to the series of questions presented to the user, the rules cause the system to access all of the associated objects needed to assemble the document.).

Claim 38:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain knowledge comprises domain knowledge elements* (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 26, Porter discloses this limitation), *said domain knowledge elements being linked to said document knowledge variables* (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation),

wherein said domain knowledge elements are dynamically bound to said document

knowledge variables through an object model access expression (as indicated in the

above rejection for Claim 27, Porter discloses this limitation),

wherein said method further comprises:

- *enforcing the link between said domain knowledge and said document*

  knowledge whenever a change occurs in at least one of said object model

  access expression of one of said document knowledge variables and said

  domain model (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 29, Porter discloses

  this limitation);

- *evaluating said object model access expression of each of said document*

  knowledge variables and linking them to appropriate domain knowledge

  elements whenever new document knowledge is inputted (as indicated in the

  above rejection for Claim 30, Porter discloses this limitation); *and*

- *re-evaluating the object model access expression of each of said document*

  knowledge variables whenever the domain model is reorganized (as indicated in

  the above rejection for Claim 31, Porter discloses this limitation),

wherein elements of said domain model are dynamically manipulated during an

interactive configuration of a document (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 27,

Porter discloses rules that establish the links generated at runtime between the series of

questions presented to the user, the answers submitted by the user and the objects that

are accessed in order to assemble the document).

Claim 39:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein elements of said domain model are dynamically manipulated during an interactive configuration of a document* (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 38, Porter discloses this limitation).

Claim 40:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein elements of said domain model are dynamically manipulated by a user during an interactive configuration of a document* (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system submits the series of questions to the user and receives answer input by the user to access the associated objects in order to assemble the document).

Claim 41:

Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

- *re-using previously authored text and description of the document and domain* (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses "domain objects" that are used to assemble documents. These domain objects comprise "*previously authored text and description of the document and domain*" that are reused when creating documents.).

Claim 42:

      Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

* *explicitly defining declarative knowledge representations that enable automatic assembly of documents through automatic creation of a document assembly program* (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses objects that are used to obtain input from the user and assemble a document. The document assembly system takes the input data (i.e., the answers) submitted by the user, creates an "input data" object and accesses all of the associated objects via associated procedures in order to dynamically assemble the document. Thus, the system comprises "*explicitly defining declarative knowledge representations that enable automatic assembly of documents through automatic creation of a document assembly program.*").

Claim 43:

      Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein no programming is required for document assembly* (Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system does not require the user to write code during document assembly. Rather, after the user submits the input data, the system performs the document assembly.).

Claim 44:

      Porter discloses *the method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

- *asserting declarative links between existing knowledge structures* (As indicated

  in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses objects that are used to obtain

  input from the user and assemble a document. The document assembly system

  takes the input data (i.e., the answers) submitted by the user, creates an "input

  data" object and accesses all of the associated objects via associated

  procedures in order to dynamically assemble the document. Thus, the system

  comprises "*asserting declarative links between existing knowledge structures.*").

Claim 21:

The claim merely recites a system comprising a "*means for*" performing the

method of Claim 1. As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses the

functional limitations recited in Claim 21. Also, as clearly indicated in Porter, the

document assembly system is computer-based and thus includes all computer

hardware and software needed to assemble documents. Applicant's "*means for*"

performing the functions recited in the claim include no hardware and software

components that are not disclosed in Porter.

Thus, Porter discloses every limitation of Claim 21, as indicated in the above

rejection for Claim 1.

Claim 25:

Claim 25 merely recites computer software for performing the method of Claim 1.

Porter discloses computer software that performs the method recited in Claim 1. Thus,

Porter discloses every limitation of Claim 25, as indicated in the above rejection for

Claim 1.

Claim 37:

Porter discloses *a method of generating document* (see Figures 1-10; see

Column 1, Line 1 through Column 20, Line 34 – Porter discloses this limitation, as

indicated in the cited figures and text), *comprising:*

- *rendering document knowledge as textual components with variable fields* (as

  indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation);

- *building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge* (as

  indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation),

  wherein said building an object-oriented domain model comprises organizing

  data input by a user into said domain model (as indicated in the above rejection

  for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation); *and*

- *linking said document knowledge to said domain knowledge by linking said*

  domain knowledge to document knowledge variables (as indicated in the above

  rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 33-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 33-36:

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the combination of limitations recited by the claims. More specifically, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the specific rules of ORAL that are recited in the claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01/23/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Prior Art Reference:

Applicant argues that Porter fails to disclose "*linking said document knowledge to said domain knowledge, by linking said domain knowledge to document knowledge variables.*" Applicant supports the argument by observing that the "*linking*" performed by the present invention does not require programming procedures. Rather, a link is created using two methods comprising:

- the user points at a class of document component in the document component

  library and then points to a document node in a specific document model; or

- input is collected from the user, and the input values are used to connect a

  document object to a domain object.

Thus, Applicant argues, the user is not required to write programs that generate and

assemble text, as in Porter. See *Response* – Page 11, third paragraph through Page

13, third full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Firstly, the examiner notes that these arguments were submitted in the response

dated 01/23/2006. In the Advisory Action dated 01/31/2006, the examiner commented

that Applicant was using features that were not claimed to support the arguments.

Applicant responded by filing a Request for Continued Examination dated 02/23/2006

that added new Claims 41-44, which recite these features. As indicated in the above

rejections, the subject matter recited in Claims 41-43 is not supported in the original

disclosure.

Secondly, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a

document assembly system comprises objects that are used to obtain input from the

user and assemble documents. For example, the document assembly system

expressly links the "Construction" domain to the "Loan Type" variable and the "Texas"

domain to the "DocST" variable. That is, when the user enters "Construction" into the

"Loan Type" question, the system links this data input with the "Construction" domain

and thus accesses all of the associated objects needed to assemble that particular type

of document. Also, factors that affect the document content appear as variables or

procedures in source code rules. That is, the rules link the document model with the

domain objects used to assemble the document.

This disclosure comprises one of the two methods for *"linking"* identified by

Applicant (i.e., input is collected from the user, and the input values are used to connect

a document object to a domain object). Accordingly, Porter discloses *"linking said*

document knowledge to said domain knowledge, by linking said domain knowledge to

document knowledge variables."

In regard to Applicant's argument that the user of the present invention is not

required to write programs that generate and assemble text, the examiner notes that the

user of Porter also is not required to write programs because the programming has

already been written. In Porter, the user enters input, and the documents are

automatically generated without the user writing additional programming. Also, the

present invention requires a computer to execute the recited method steps. Therefore,

the method steps are executed via computer programming.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is 571-272-4137.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-
2100.

WDH
March 30, 2006

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100